

BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
Minutes

A regular meeting of the Budget & Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on November 15, 2005.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Michael Caracciolo, Chairman
Leg. Angie Carpenter, Vice•Chairman
Leg. Daniel P. Losquadro
Leg. Cameron Alden
Leg. William J. Lindsay (excused absence)
Leg. Peter O'Leary
Leg. Ricardo Montano

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator John M. Kennedy, Jr., Twelfth District
Mea Knapp, Counsel to the Legislature
Ian Barry, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Ilona Julius, Deputy Clerk

Jim Spero, Director of Budget Review
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review
Robert Lipp, Budget Review
Marie Ammirati, Aide to Leg. O'Leary
Carl Yellon, Aide to Leg. Kennedy
Doug Sutherland, Aide to Leg. Carpenter
Ben Zwirn, Assistant Deputy County Executive
Bob Bortzfield, Budget Office, County Executive
Allen Kovesdy, Budget Office, County Executive
Jeanine Dillon, County Executive's Office
Jacqueline Caputi, Assistant County Attorney
Frank Tassone, Aide to Majority Leader
Linda Burkhardt, Chief of Staff, PO's Office
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 9:50 AM)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Will everyone please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Losquadro.

(SALUTATION)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Mr. Isles, would you please come forward? Good morning, Tom. I understand you want to address the Committee on IR 2101.

MR. ISLES:

Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Go right ahead.

MR. ISLES:

Just some very brief comments. IR 2101 is a resolution introduced for the purpose of dedicating certain lands located in Ronkonkoma to the County Nature Preserve. The County does own these lands to the best of our knowledge. The lands are in a park category.

Our comment on this is that the concern for moving too quickly to put this into Nature Preserve •• the property, as I said, do contain wetlands, are environmentally sensitive. Our concerns are primarily two fold. Number one, is that parts of these properties have been and are used for drainage purposes under the County highway system. Years ago the County Department of Public Works created a rather interesting environmental remediation project on part of this property to intercept storm water run•off by creating a baffle wetland design.

Our point, then, with the Nature Preserve is that as soon as we jump to Nature Preserve, we potentially freeze this property. And our ability then to do further improvements, corrections and enhancements may be constrained in the future.

And then secondly the balance of the property, here again, is used for passive recreational purposes. We understand that there has been some interest in putting park benches in. We don't object to that idea of further public access in a limited passive manner. But, here again, typically with Nature Preserve is that there would be some sort of process to develop a plan saying what should this property be used for, have a management plan for how that use is to occur. And then knowing with eyes open before we actually put it into the Nature Preserve category.

So, fundamentally there's no objection to the concept of Nature Preserve. We just think that it has to be preceded by some investigation in terms of the Highway Department, DPW impacts in terms of their drainage functions that may be critical to the County highway system.

And then secondly in terms of the future management of this property, I think it should be clear, because it's a one-way path, my understanding is that to remove a parcel from Nature Preserve requires a referendum of the voters of Suffolk County. So, it's not an easy thing to do. So, we would just caution moving too quickly on this. We think there should be some careful review of the property ensuring that the County's interests are protected as well as the property interest before we jump to a Nature Preserve category.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Has that been conveyed to the sponsor?

MR. ISLES:

I believe Public Works has, but I have not. So, if you'd like I'll be happy to do that to the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Would you, please?

MR. ISLES:

I would certainly be pleased to do so.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Would you send him some correspondence outlining your statement this morning?

MR. ISLES:

I will do that, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Hi, Tom.

MR. ISLES:

Hi.

LEG. ALDEN:

What would be the benefit of putting a parcel like this into the Nature Preserve Program?

MR. ISLES:

Nature Preserve Program is reserved for the most protective category in the County's Park system. So, the County Park system is protected in the sense that the County can't develop that for non-park uses under state law and so forth. This takes it a notch above that. And when I mentioned before it basically freezes the property, that once you have a management plan, once you decide this property shall be used for passion hiking trails and so forth, if you then want to go back and put in soccer fields or something like that, under the Nature Preserve Program you can't do that.

So, it puts it in the most restrictive category. It protects it from changes and other types of park use that may be considered detrimental. The Nature Preserve handbook talks about criteria for being in the Nature Preserve such as it must have environmental value of wetlands and dangerous species and so forth.

So, the advantage and answer to your question is that it protects the property in the maximum extent possible. That we think is a good thing. But, here again, we think we need to do our homework on this before we do that in the event we say, you know what, we could have put in a better storm water design so we're protecting the wetlands. And we can't do that now because we put it into Nature Preserve. We just don't want to be in that situation where we're prohibited from doing things that are good for the property.

LEG. ALDEN:

Just two more questions. First off, though, by putting it into the Nature

Preserve Program, we're actually protecting the property from ourselves.

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. And secondly do you maintain a list of things that you think that either now or in the future should go into the Nature Preserve Program? Or do you evaluate each one individually as a Legislator would bring it up? Or how does that work?

MR. ISLES:

I'm not aware of a list. The County Parks Department may have a list. I'm not aware of a list. We have, you know, worked with the Legislature in coming up with the rating system for park acquisitions. We have refined and improved that, I believe, over the years; the past two years. So, I think we do have the information to identify those that are most sensitive.

Let me point out, too, that anything we buy in the Pine Barrens core automatically goes into Nature Preserve because that's already been determined as a generic way. But •• so in answer to your question, I'm not aware of a list. And in terms of the need, here again, we think it's fine but we think it should be done very carefully and cautiously.

LEG. ALDEN:

So, you don't have a list. But do you periodically go and review the County stock of properties to see if, you know, we're utilizing them properly, whether they maybe should be restricted or maybe used for, you know, even for affordable housing. It could be a park with a possibility of using some of the, you know, surrounding acreage as affordable housing or, you know, different •• soccer fields like you mentioned before.

MR. ISLES:

Well, just for the development of housing, no, we're not looking at using county parks for the development of housing. In terms ••

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, just county inventory?

MR. ISLES:

The County inventory of land? Oh, absolutely. That's done on a regular basis in terms of the tax surplus lots. They are reviewed by the Department of Economic Development and Workforce Housing as well as Planning. So, that is an ongoing activity.

In terms of the use of County parks for other uses, Commissioner Foley can certainly speak on that much better than I can. But it is something that is a significant issue in terms of the increased demand of the public for use of County facilities, for active recreational uses, for passive recreational uses. So, I think he's always or constantly looking at those issues of trying to balance preservation conservation with recreational needs, cultural needs and so forth.

And, here again, in answer to your question, one of the things we are doing in terms of that inventory is we have been working on a project with the other departments, with the County Executive's Office to come up with a master inventory of all the County's lands. There really hasn't been a comprehensive well described inventory. And that's one of the things we do have ongoing as a project right now. And I think that's a good starting point in terms of knowing what we have, what programs we bought them under, what the constraints are in the use of those properties; especially when we do have somebody that comes to the Parks Department says we want to put in a soccer field for the community, does the program allow it, does the parcel when we bought it allow that kind of use to happen. So, we'll have a better ability to answer those questions quicker. And also I think it's a good starting point in terms of then looking at other Nature Preserve and things like that but, any way.

LEG. ALDEN:

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLES:

I'll do the letter to the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Thank you, Tom.

MR. ISLES:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Is there anyone else who would like to address the Committee during the public portion? Hearing none, we'll go to public hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Please note on today's agenda **2086 the second item for public hearing has been withdrawn.** So, that brings us to the first which is 2060. Is there anyone here to speak on **2060 (adopting local law, a local law implementing historic property tax exemption for Suffolk County residents)**

MS. JULIUS:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

MS. JULIUS:

The affidavits are in proper order for the public hearings.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Thank you, Madam clerk. Hearing no one, is there a motion on 2060?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to close.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to close by Legislator Carpenter, second by Legislator O'Leary. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved unanimously. Closed. **(Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2141 (adopting local law, a Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues). Is there anyone here to address the Committee on 2141? I'm sorry. 2141. No one here to address the Committee. Is there a motion?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to close.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to close. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Public hearing closed on 2141. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That brings us to tabled resolutions. **1437, amending the 2005 operating budget and transferring funds for project MOST.** Is there a motion?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Explanation.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Mr. Zwirn, do you want to address the Committee? And perhaps Budget Review can just give us a quick synopsis or Counsel? It looks like it's \$3500.

MR. ZWIRN:

Right. This was a member item taken from •• I think it was Pay•As•You•Go money. And that's why it's been tabled. We just thought it was the wrong offset to be used for a member item.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And it's still a Pay•As•You•Go? I see it says transfer from General Fund.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Do we have a clarification where the funds •• the \$3500's coming from? Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Also, is this a new initiative? Or was this something that was included as a member item initiative with last year's budget?

MR. KOVESDY:

It was new and ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Use the microphone, please.

MR. KOVESDY:

Good morning. It was new. And it's a transfer from the general capital reserve fund \$3500. That's why we objected. And the Department new nothing about it. They didn't ask for the Department for funding.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Then I would just ask Budget Review this wasn't included in the last

year's member items?

MS. VIZZINI:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Where in Suffolk County is this after school program?

MR. ZWIRN:

East Hampton.

MS. VIZZINI:

East Hampton.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

It's just for Town of East Hampton? Okay. So, is there a motion? I'm sorry. Motion to table by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled? **(Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

1939. The public hearing is closed. **This is a Charter Law to amend the Suffolk County Charter to provide for ongoing public disclosure of operating budget status.** Gail, since you and I collaborated on this a little bit, perhaps you can just inform the Committee what the resolution would accomplish.

MS. VIZZINI:

Basically it requires a Director of Budget Review and the Budget Director to report routinely to the Budget and Finance Committee on the status of the operating budget and the budget model.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And you're opinion with respect to this resolution, is that something that you would encourage be done; something you'd support?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes, I would. I think it formalizes the intent that's in the Charter already.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Thank you. I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator O'Leary.

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes, Ben.

MR. ZWIRN:

The only comment the County Executive has we do this now. And I think Gail says it would be to formalize it. We come on a regular basis. And we're always here to answer questions or be able to get questions answered that the Committee asks for. I think we've done that, I think, certainly the last year. So, we just thought it was an unnecessary bill.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

While that is for the most part true, and I would acknowledge that, that has not always been the case with previous administrations. And that may not be the case with perspective administrations. So, I don't see any harm really in codifying this accordingly. Yes, Robert?

MR. LIPP:

Excuse me. Also, the only concern that we had, we don't mind formalizing it, but there was some language in section C 45 of the Charter that didn't seem exactly appropriate for this. In particular it requires forecasts for the next eight quarters. And typically what we do is we look at the current year and the next year. So, for instance if we're talking January or March of 2006, we'd say here's what our projection is for '06 and for '07. So, for eight quarters it would go into at least 2008 a lot of it. So, that seemed a little odd. And to look at specific amounts above a certain threshold isn't necessarily appropriate either; just to •• just give a general flavor of big ticket items. So, I think that the language is a little about too rigid in the

Charter. Perhaps it could be cleaned up, the resolution.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. But that's in the Charter now. That's not in this resolution.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Just so the Committee doesn't get confused. All this does creates a new section. And as Gail has already stated, it just formalizes the existing practice. It doesn't require eight quarter projections or six quarters or anything like that. If that needs to be redressed, then, I would encourage my colleagues to do that going forward. If we have another cycle, then, I'll sponsor that resolution. Okay. So, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

1957 (adopting local law, a Charter Law to require action on the annual county Operating Budget before the General Election). This is a resolution I also sponsored. This would require the adoption of the county budget before election day. Again. I'm going to reiterate what I've held as a long held belief here that if our counterparts elsewhere can do it, so can we. And if it means extra work for some people, then so be it. I think the bottom line here is the taxpayer that writes the check through their property taxes has a right to now before election day what their county taxes are going to be in the following year. So, I'm making a motion to approve, second by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

IR 1958, establishing a pilot program to repeal an unfair home heating fuel nuisance tax on Suffolk County homeowners.

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Alden, the sponsor.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Second by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Approved. **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

1964 (repealing home heating nuisance tax on Suffolk County residents) What's your pleasure? Same motion, same second, same vote.
(Tabled. Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)

And **1970. It's withdrawn.** Yes. That was the memo we just got. Okay.

TABLED SENSE RESOLUTION

S.036 (Sense of the Legislature resolution requesting the New York State Legislature to enact restaurant tax•free weeks). This will be stricken if it's not acted upon favorably today. Is there a motion?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Carpenter, second by Legislator Montano. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **It's tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

INTRODUCTORY PRIME

IR 2003, amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds for West Babylon School District Wellness Program.

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

MR. ZWIRN:

The County Executive is opposed to this because of the offset. It's taking Social Security money. So, he's being consistent.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion to table.

LEG. ALDEN:

Could you hold off for one second? Through the Chair?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes; go ahead.

LEG. ALDEN:

One question of Budget Review. Was this included in last year's budget process as an initiative from a Legislator?

MS. VIZZINI:

This is in addition to the original ••

LEG. ALDEN:

This is an additional?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'll second Legislator's Losquadro motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

We have a motion to table by Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2004 (amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds to the Bay Shore Chamber of Commerce.)

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to approve. This is a transfer from one agency to another.

MS. VIZZINI:

It's a name change.

MR. KOVESDY:

It's a name change.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So, we have a motion and a second by Legislator O'Leary. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2005 (amending the 2005 Operating Budget to create one new position in the Tobacco Cessation Program within the Department of Health Services) Is there a motion?

LEG. MONTANO:

Table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Montano, second by Legislator O'Leary. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2015 (adopting local law, a Charter Law to provide for enhanced transitional public safety sales and compensating use tax revenue payments to certain towns and villages)

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to table for public hearing.

MS. JULIUS:

Mr. Chairman, it has to be tabled for public hearing.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes, for public hearing.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Carpenter, second by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2032 (authorizing the County Treasurer to borrow cash funds from other County funds for 2005) Motion by the Chair, second by Legislator Carpenter. I'm sorry. O'Leary. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ALDEN:

Just on the motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

On the motion. Go ahead.

LEG. ALDEN:

Budge Review, is that normal? We just authorized \$215 million in anticipatory notes.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, I noticed that this was requested by the Treasurer. Prior to our authorizing the recent BANs, the cash flow reports from the Treasurer show there was a cash flow problem. They did not reflect the BANs that had been borrowed prior to that. I think •• I don't really know. I didn't have an

opportunity to talk to the Treasurer in terms of why they requested this, but I think it solidifies his authority to borrow between the funds.

LEG. ALDEN:

At what terms? Are terms listed in this too or ••

MS. VIZZINI:

They are the terms that exists, which is that he can borrow between funds for cash flow purposes. And those funds pay back the other funds with interest.

LEG. ALDEN:

But not with TANS.

MS. VIZZINI:

No.

LEG. CARPENTER:

No. These are in kind transfers.

MS. VIZZINI:

No. We borrow based on our need for cash.

LEG. ALDEN:

And what's the restriction as far as time? The calendar year; the fiscal year, then; right?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes. It's within the ••

LEG. ALDEN:

Restoration would have to occur within the fiscal year.

LEG. CARPENTER:

On or before December 31st.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yeah. The resolution specifies before the end of the calendar year.

LEG. ALDEN:

Let me just make sure.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yeah.

MS. VIZZINI:

Within the fiscal year, yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. We have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)

2035 (adopting fiscal discipline tax constraint (Mandated) Operating Budget with Suffolk resident Safety Net for 2006 Smart Management) Is there a motion?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Explanation.

LEG. MONTANO:

Explanation, please.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Explanation. Counsel. Or would you like to address that, Mr. Zwirn?

MR. ZWIRN:

These go with the 2006 budget. These establish the reserve funds on both the mandatory and discretionary side of the budget.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Counsel?

MS. KNAPP:

I think that until such time as the budget amendments are completed, this may indeed be unnecessary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

Same with **2036 (adopting fiscal discipline tax constraint (Discretionary) Operating Budget with Suffolk resident Safety Net for 2006 through Smart Management)**

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Tabled. Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2043, amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds to various agencies. Legislator Alden, this is your resolution.

LEG. ALDEN:

This is part of the original budget from last year. And Budget Review had advised me to put money in a certain place which probably is not appropriate any more. And this isn't additional money. This is just old money.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

2043.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yeah. The County Executive •• it's the same argument that he made before. The only problem that some of these contract agencies is getting these contract processed before the end of the year. Just from •• County Executive just wanted to let you know that they're going to do everything they can to do it. But after September 1st, which is really the unofficial cut •off day, it's going to be very tough between now and December 31st to get all these processed. But they'll make their best efforts. Just don't want to get expectations up too high.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

We appreciate that.

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion by Legislator Alden, second by the Chair. All in favor? On the motion.

LEG. CARPENTER:

On the motion. Just to the point of the willingness of the County Executive's office to get these •• this paper work processed in a timely fashion, I'm really delighted to hear that. I know that I had gotten a report from a couple of my agencies that the paper work had been sent to the County Executive's office from the appropriate department in June. And it wasn't until, you know, early November that they were notified that they had to present a copy of their original 501 (3) (c) paper work. And with some of

these agencies that, you know, a Little League that's been in place •• it wasn't a Little League, but, you know, organizations that have been in place for many, many years, they don't necessarily have their hands on that paper work. So, it presented a little bit of a problem. They've been resolved. But I think that the lag from June to November from when the paper work was sent to the County Executive's office in June and to only hear in November that there might be a problem, maybe, you know, you could look at that process and try to speed that up a little bit.

MR. ZWIRN:

I'll bring it back. I know they've tried to •• I know they worked with the legislative staff. The County Attorney's office has worked with them. And if we had individual contracts that had problems, we tried to, you know, look at them individually to see what was causing them. But I'll bring that back and see if there's an institutional problem.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Great.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Good. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved?

2044 (amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds for various agencies) Motion by the Chair, second by Legislator O'Leary. It's the same situation. These are just appropriating funds that were earmarked for legislative district initiatives. Unfortunately the organizations couldn't be identified until well into this year for a variety of reasons. They've now been identified. They're included in the resolution and they know about the time constraint. And we are working very closely with every one of these groups to make certain to the best extent we can that they meet all of the requisite requirements to have their forms and paper work approved before the end of the calendar year, Ben. So, motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2060 (adopting local law implementing historic property tax exemption for Suffolk County residents) This we had a public hearing

on earlier. I'm sorry?

LEG. CARPENTER:

Yeah, we did ••

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Did 2044. On 2060, public hearing was closed. Motion to approve by Legislator •• on the motion.

LEG. CARPENTER:

On the motion. I just have ••

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Is there a second?

LEG. ALDEN:

I'll second.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I'll second •• okay. I just want to make sure I understand this. That the exemption would be for the increase in assessed valuation for the improvements; not that there would be a total exemption from taxes on the parcel; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Speaking like a treasurer should.

MS. KNAPP:

To the extent of any increase in value attributable to such alteration or rehabilitation. So, the answer is yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Okay. Very good. Thank you.

LEG. ALDEN:

Mr. Chair. Through the Chair?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

What's the financial impact? County's bottom line?

MS. VIZZINI:

We don't have a dollar amount on that. It's going to be very difficult to quantify how many people with historic homes will be taking advantage of something like this. The overall impact would be distributed to the rest of the citizens. Any time you give a particular group a break •• I'm not •• it's very difficult to quantify the break to the historic homeowners. But the cost for the County to do business still remains the same and will be distributed to the remaining taxpayers.

LEG. ALDEN:

Is there any kind of way to •• I mean a guesstimate even? Because obviously we wouldn't •• we wouldn't be proposing legislation unless people had asked for it. So, did a lot of people ask for it? Did a few people ask for it? You know •• here's my fear. You know, guide lines can be changed, too, as far as what's a historic home and that type of thing. So •• like my house, can I have that •• it is. It's 1910. It's a historic home.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Is it designated as such?

LEG. ALDEN:

No, but I'm thinking now I might go out and do that, you know. And then build a little castle.

MS. VIZZINI:

Part of the intent is to encourage people with historic homes to make these improvements. Very often they're in downtown areas.

LEG. ALDEN:

No, but I'm encouraged. I'm in a downtown area. I'm getting a lot of

criteria here. So ••

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Go for it.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm looking for tax exemptions, you know, and roll backs. But there's no guess on how much this would affect us? In all fairness the sponsor's not here so I don't know how many people approached her to have this done or whatever but ••

MS. VIZZINI:

We'll look into it. When we prepare the fiscal impact, we'll look into it.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

LEG. CARPENTER:

If I could?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

It appears to me that this is prospective. So, it's not like we're losing any revenue that we've already got coming in. This would be projected increased revenue for any homes that would be improved and the value would be increased; and thereby their assessment would be increased and their tax payments would be increased. So, it's not like we're reducing anything. And the people that are doing these improvements would be generating an industry of, you know, home improvement contractors who pay sales taxes so you'd have •• and they should all be paying them. And I know the County Executive's been very vigilant in trying to make sure that that, in fact, does happen. But you have increased sales tax revenue so it's spurring •• you know it's economic development in a way. So, you know, it seems to me that this is something very worthy of being supported.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2065 (amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds to the appropriate Debt Services Account to pay debt service costs associated with the Environmental Facilities) Explanation. I'm going to request, Allen, an explanation. It's a County Executive resolution.

MR. KOVESDY:

The fiscal impact statement states that the County's entered into a financing agreement with the Environmental Facilities Corporation for the acquisition of the Duke property and the acquisition of ABR Realty property parcels known as Fox Lair One and Fox Lair Two properties. Sufficient funds currently exist within the fund balance of Fund 477 to cover the cost of debt service. And it's funded. The total estimated debt charges will be \$10,824,122. And the funding exists.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I have a question on that because looking at the Resolve Clause, the first Resolve Clause, it clearly identified "is hereby added from fund 477." So, the question of Counsel is, is this an appropriate use of 477 fund account? Has this been done before? Maybe it has. I just don't recall.

MS. KNAPP:

This is a land acquisition. And to the extent that •• 477?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yeah, 477.

MS. KNAPP:

No. I'm going to defer to Budget Review. Kevin's not here unfortunately. 477 is specifically •• is different than the rest of the Article 12 monies.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That's what I thought.

MS. KNAPP:

No, it's definitely not a proper use of 477.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That's why I brought it up. It was right there. And I'm glad you mentioned it, Allen. I appreciate your forthrightness because to me this seems unprecedented. But if I stand corrected, please correct me now.

MS. KNAPP:

I'm surprised there's enough money in 477 very frankly.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I mean we're using 477 now like a real slush fund. I'm going to make a motion to table, second by Legislator O'Leary. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**
Next year may be a different story but this says '05.

MS. KNAPP:

Also, as long as there is •• I had another question on this one. The Whereas refers to \$10,824,000. And yet ••

LEG. ALDEN:

We spent all that. Most of it.

MS. KNAPP:

But then the transfer from 477 is a 1,135,000.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Right. You may want to check that out.

MS. KNAPP:

Something doesn't seem to be right about this resolution.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. We have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions? It is tabled. **(Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2067, to readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction or errors/County Treasurer by the County Legislature.

Motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Carpenter. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

Same motion, same second on **2069 (to readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction or errors/County Treasurer by the County Legislature.** All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2070 (to readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge backs on correction or errors/County Treasurer by the County Legislature.)

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

That brings us to **2085 (amending the 2005 Operating Budget and transferring funds to Long Island Maritime Museum)** Motion by Legislator Alden, second by the Chair. This appropriates •• this is a small amount of money for the Long Island Maritime Museum.

LEG. ALDEN:

It's old money, though. It's •• it was included in legislative initiatives.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2088, transferring contingent funding for various contract agencies, phase three. Just a brief explanation, please.

MS. VIZZINI:

2088 is phase three of the member item funding.

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. So, these are basically legislative district initiatives similar to the one that I sponsored earlier and the one that Legislator Alden sponsored. But this is an omnibus type resolution.

MS. VIZZINI:

These are the smaller agencies that are funded out of the 4981 monies; the member item monies.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion by •• same comment, Ben?

MR. ZWIRN:

Same comment. Not about the offset, just the timing is going to be very hard for them to get this done in time.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Same motion •• I mean by motion Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. **That's approved unanimously. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2090, amending the Suffolk County classification and salary plan in connection with new sanitarian positions in the Department of Health Services. Could you just elaborate, Counsel, how many positions and what the •• are they offset?

MS. KNAPP:

All right. It's four sanitarians, two grade 21's and two trainees at grade 16. There were four positions abolished. And at least one of the positions I show as being the government liaison officer that was used as an offset in

an earlier resolution that was tabled. So, it's still available.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. So, the four new positions are created by virtue of offsets from four other positions that include ••

MR. KOVESDY:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

MR. KOVESDY:

If I might, the government liaison position was abolished in the recommended budget. It no longer exists when the budget •• when the budget will be approved so that we don't feel that's a realistic offset. And the Health Department is not in favor of this resolution.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right. Let me ask you, Allen. If you eliminate that position, the three other positions are grades 9, 19 and 31. Would there be sufficient funds in those three positions to offset the four new positions? Because they're lower grades than the 31.

MR. KOVESDY:

In my opinion there are sufficient funds in the Health Department. The Health Department has enough vacancies to deal with this. And we feel that the recommended budget dealt adequately with the positions for the Health Department. And this resolution is not necessary.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Actually, that's the point. Didn't we just deal with this issue in the budget? And shouldn't this be included in the budget that's on the •• that we just passed the other day?

MR. KOVESDY:

Yeah, we're very satisfied. We provided the necessary positions there in the budget.

LEG. MONTANO:

Were these positions taken up during the budget process? Gail?

MS. VIZZINI:

We didn't create any additional positions in the omnibus. We're checking the 2006 recommended budget so see if there were additional positions of sanitation created. As far as Allen's comments regarding the fact that the government liaison officer is abolished in 2006, this is amending the 2005 operating budget.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

What is the likelihood that this could even be accomplished this year?

MS. VIZZINI:

The positions would be •• the positions would be created. And if they were to be filled, it would require an approved 167.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So, it's highly unlikely that these positions could be •• these individuals could be hired before the end of the calendar year. Ben? Ben? For the record, Ben?

MR. ZWIRN:

Even though Legislator Binder is the sponsor of this, I think it would be very hard for the County Executive to get these SCINs signed by whatever efforts could be made on his behalf.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right. Do we have a motion? Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, actually I just have a comment on this. And to answer Legislator

Montano's question before, there was a lack of information brought when we had the budget hearing on the Health Department. And a lot of that can be attributed to the fact that the Commissioner never bothered to come down to address the questions that we had. So •• I mean I was •• I was shocked at all the questions on how the budget was developed and the different philosophies on how we're going to •• you know, like deliver a health plan to people in Suffolk County. And just •• he wasn't here. And the person that he did send, while they took a little bit of abuse that day, there were •• some heated exchanges occurred •• they had just recently been transferred there and really weren't familiar with the preparation of the budget and the intent of the budget. So, I just, you know, I found that, you know, not a good way to run a Health Department. And unfortunately it left representatives of the County Executive's office trying to scramble to include some information for us so that we could go forward with a budget. So, you know, I applaud their efforts trying to do that, but the lack of the Commissioner or •• you know, I don't know why he wasn't here but it was said he had a meeting some place else or something like that, but that was weak.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Is there a motion? No motion. I'll make a motion to table.

MS. VIZZINI:

One point of clarification. According to the recommend budget, the Health Department did request four new public health sanitarians.

LEG. ALDEN:

There was no one here to answer questions.

MS. VIZZINI:

Right. But they were not provided in the recommended budget.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I was going to say they requested those positions. Aside from the

government liaison officer that was eliminated as part of the recommended budget, were the other positions recommended to be removed or does the Health Department feel that they were still required as part of their operation? I do understand we need more health sanitarians, absolutely. But if we remove those other positions, are we just diminishing their capacity to serve in another area and going to create problems there?

LEG. ALDEN:

Would you suffer an interruption?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sure.

LEG. ALDEN:

And the problem is we can't get an answer to that and we couldn't at the budget time because the Commissioner doesn't bother to show up and inform us on these •• and doesn't want to answer our questions for whatever reason?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. I made a motion to table, second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

2100's been withdrawn.

2101 (dedicating certain lands now owned by the County of Suffolk to the County Nature Preserve pursuant to Article I of the Suffolk County Charter and Section 406 of the New York Real Property Tax Law • Lilly Pond and Nature Preserve, Town of Smithtown • and amending the 2005 Operating Budget) Legislator Kennedy, would you like to speak to this? Just so you are aware, John, Mr. Isles, the Planning Director, was here earlier and made a statement with respect to this resolution. He's going to be sending you correspondence relating to that testimony. And perhaps just Counsel could highlight what the essence of his

comments were so you know.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

MS. KNAPP:

Mr. Isles expressed some concerns. I don't think I would characterize it as being necessarily in opposition nor in support. However, he expressed concerns in that the dedication to the Nature Preserve would essentially freeze the County's ability to perhaps increase drainage on this property in the future. On the flip side of that he acknowledged that the County's ability to use it as active parkland would also be restrained.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Because it's a preserved status.

MS. KNAPP:

I think his •• I think that the thrust of his comments was that they weren't ready yet to say that this should be in a nature preserve until such time as DPW and Planning and Parks were able to consult with what the Nature Preserve Plan should look like.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Counsel, and thank you, Mr. Chair and thanks for the opportunity to go ahead and talk about this resolution. Unfortunately I wasn't here, I guess, when Mr. Isles raised these comments. But interestingly, I guess, I'd like to just go through the Committee a couple of his points; point by point.

Actually Parks Commissioner Ron Foley and I and some of his staff did have an opportunity to go ahead and walk the property. And Parks Commissioner is in full concurrence as a matter of fact with going ahead and moving this into Nature Preserve acknowledging that there really is no other use that this area could be put to other than the most restrictive or passive use that is laid out under Nature Preserve. There was one request to go ahead and exempt two parcels from the total •• I think it's about 30 tax map parcels that are included in the dedication for the purpose of DPW to go ahead and

get access for five holding ponds that actually sit within the property.

For all intent and purposes this is about 90 acres of marshland that are headwaters adjacent to Lake Ronkonkoma. We did go ahead and exclude those two tax map parcels in recognition to what DPW had requested. And so Commissioner Bartha is in support of this resolution as well. So I find it interesting that Planning Commissioner would raise issues for the two departments whose monitoring and custodial purposes are most germane to it and are both in agreement.

Another point I guess I would raise for the Committee is interestingly enough all of the signage adjacent to the entry ways to this park identify it now as Nature Preserve. And it has been signed that way for at least five or six years. The underlying steps necessary to actually do the dedication for whatever reason apparently never did take place. But for all intent and purposes it has been treated as and is utilized only as the most restrictive and passive uses that are contemplated under Nature Preserve.

So really what this is doing is, is bringing to fruition and taking the underlying ministerial steps to accomplish what has been basically the use of the park in the area for the whole time. It is host to many endangered plant species. It's a habitat to Great Horned Owls, which are on the rare species for bird life. We've had letters of support from the Audubon Society. We've had statements of support from the local civic organizations. And this is something that's been known to the Department and known to Mr. Isles and the other pertinent County departments for well over a couple of months now.

Prior to the comments that I heard this morning that were stated by Mr. Isles, I've had absolutely no indication that there was any desire on the part of Planning to do anything other than support it. I think it makes sense. I think it's prudent. I think it just follows along with for all intent and purposes what we've utilized the parkland as at this point. And I'd be happy to entertain any questions.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Sure.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Is there any _com bomba_ there?

LEG. KENNEDY:

There may be some invasive species, but I'm not prepared to articulate the specific species.

LEG. O'LEARY:

No _com bomba_?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I don't know about _com bomba_.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

We'll make a motion since we have until Tuesday •• perhaps you can reconcile these discrepancies with Mr. Isles and others and have them come before the Legislature on Tuesday.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Make a motion to approve.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Second.

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right. Let me get the motion by Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator O'Leary. On the motion.

LEG. ALDEN:

And through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

The biggest benefit I can see as far as •• well, there's two. One would be the restriction of the use of the property. But it's kind of being restricted right now. So, I'm not sure about the urgency of that.

But the other big thing is that once we put it into Nature Preserve, we don't pay any taxes anymore. So right now we're paying taxes to all the locals. If it goes to Nature Preserve, then •• and I can see that as a benefit to Suffolk County especially if we're going to maintain it as in the preserved status. But why is there a •• why is it imperative right now to move on it?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I think there's an urgency, and this comes out of some of the work that was done with the Tri•Town Task Force with Lake Ronkonkoma. As you know, we both sit on that Task Force. And there's been a major push or initiative to go ahead and work towards upgrade and improvement of the water quality of the Lake itself focussing on the watershed in this surrounding area. And so this goes part and parcel, I think, with making certain that all of those drainage areas are going to be preserved exclusively for just that; to go ahead and allow the natural percolation and drainage functions to go ahead unimpeded.

And, again, as I said, since there are many fragile species in there, it's habitat to a lot of wildlife. It makes sense to go ahead and give that area the level of protection. And certainly the enhanced fiscal benefit makes sense at this point. It's always good to save money.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, the big question then that you're going to have to resolve for Tuesday's meeting is, and it was brought up by Commissioner Isles, if there has to be any drainage improvement, and we do this, then, you have to actually go through a referendum. It's almost impossible •• no, it is impossible to go back and touch the property. So, if you wanted to put a bench or you wanted to put a drain pipe or just any type of relief from puddling or if it's running out into a road or water running onto the property, you can't touch the property. So that's just what •• I caught that as a thrust of what he wanted to bring up.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Which I appreciate. And as a matter of fact I'll be happy to go ahead and engage in dialogue with him about that. But that's also why I did make the additional contacts with the Department of Public Works. And they were quite content with the way the drainage function is going on the property now with the five holding ponds they had created.

And this second request that they have the ability to exclude those two tax map parcels. So, if there would be a need to go ahead and improve, remedy, dredge, do whatever needed to be done, they have that unfettered access. And that's why we took that step. Thank you to the members of the Committee.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved unanimously. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

And the final resolution is 2141, adopting local law, a Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues. Public hearing •• this closed, yeah. Okay. So, this is eligible. And if we could just for the record, Counsel, describe the difference between this resolution and the new County budget that adopted additional revenue for towns and villages.

MS. KNAPP:

This local law, as the local law did previously that was vetoed, would make a

distribution to the towns and villages based on population. And I'll let Budget Review correct me, but my understanding of the amendments to the 2006 operating budgets was that the increases to the town and villages were simply proportional to that which was made in the past.

MS. VIZZINI:

That's correct. As was the appropriation of the contingency fund. I would also like to point out that in this resolution it references the full quarter cent rather than the maximum three eighths.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. But the contingency fund that you've made reference to, Gail, there's a net increase in '06 to towns and villages of \$1.5 million additional revenue sharing?

MS. VIZZINI:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Right. So, instead of them receiving \$3 million approximately, they'll be receiving 4.5 million?

MS. VIZZINI:

In its entirety, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Right. So it is a 50% increase over what existed last year. And this, I guess, is an attempt to make it more than that or about 100% more than it was previously. So that's what before us. This was a resolution I had sponsored previously. The County Executive had vetoed. And then that led to a compromised agreement and a commitment which was Mr. Zwirn was kind of enough to put on the record while we were adopting the discretionary budget last week; that the County Executive is committed to increasing now over the next •• beyond the 50% increase next year, incrementally increasing over the next four years or the remaining four years, the total amount of what would have been due under this resolution

initially. So, it's up to the Legislature to determine whether or not they believe the towns and villages should have it now or incrementally over a five-year period. Ben, did you want to comment?

MR. ZWIRN:

The County Executive did make his commitment. And he worked out a •• we thought was a, you know, made a big leap from where we had been in previous administrations to codify this and to say •• and to spell out how the money would be going to the east end towns and the villages across the County. So, as far as he understood, that was the deal and where his word was. And he'd like to stick to that time frame.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And, again, if you'll just restate, Ben, that there is a commitment beyond next year to incrementally increase that so that over a period of five years, the intent of this particular resolution would be implemented; correct?

MR. ZWIRN:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Montano. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (Vote: 6•0•0•1. Leg. Lindsay not present)**

That concludes the business before this Committee.

(OFF THE RECORD DISCUSSION)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

We can spend a few minutes going over that. I know Legislator Carpenter has some important business to attend to. We'll just spend a few minutes going over this memo which I very much appreciate?

MS. VIZZINI:

I just wanted to bring your attention to the fact that Budget Review continues to monitor active filled positions in the County. There's a memo I provided the Committee with several attached charts that basically shows that there are •• the hiring pattern in 2005 pretty much follows 2004. There's a net loss of 38 active positions in 2005 when you compare it to January of 2005.

The good news is that in the Department of Social Services the net gain of active positions is 12 since January of 2005. However, in the Health Department there's a net loss of 37 active positions. Active positions meaning people who get pay checks. Filled positions. It's encouraging that the number of active civilian positions has increased by seven in the Police Department since January of 2004 to a total of 585 positions. However, the number of total sworn is 36 less than the beginning of 2004. These charts kind of give you an idea of what the trend is. The trend is generally downward; although at the latter part of the year there usually is a little bit more freedom to hire, more approved 167's.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Gail, I noticed in some of the charts you related to mid•year comparisons; in others you went back to January or February of '04, which is when the charts begin. If you do that with respect to chart two in Health services, we see that there's actually been a decline in the Health Department from 1509 employees to 1449 employees. That's a 150 roughly. Or a 160 rather. Is that correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

That is correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That is significant. Now, where are those •• where are those vacancies

occurring? And what impact is that having on services, if any?

MS. VIZZINI:

That will require some future follow•up.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. And also likewise in Social Services, there's a decline of roughly 33 from February '04. And then in the Police Department likewise there's a net decrease of 36. So, we had seven additional civilian employees, but we lost 36 sworn officers; correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

That's the current status.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yeah. Perhaps for our final meeting next month, you could take a look specifically at Health Department and Social Services, those two agencies, and let us know if there are any real impacts from these •• you know, with these vacancies occurring. Maybe we're just more efficient and that would be great news.

MS. VIZZINI:

Much of the impact is addressed in our review of the operating budget. So, we'll go back to that and we'll do a little bit of an update for you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Great. Thank you.

LEG. ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

In addition, maybe we could ask •• you know, maybe they can have somebody from Health, you know, just to answer a couple of questions. I

don't want to put a lot of burden on you, Ben, because you didn't develop the budget form and things like that. And you're not operating the Department day to day. But it might be for the guy to come down or ••

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yeah, we'll request the Commissioner to come down.

LEG. ALDEN:

That might be nice.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Both Commissioners. Mr. Commission Harper and Janet.

MS. VIZZINI:

The Departments are required to complete quarterly hiring plans that are submitted to the County Executive for their review when they make their 167 determinations. So, perhaps that's something you'd perhaps ••

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Is there any other business before the Committee? Hearing none, the Committee stands adjourned.

**(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:46 AM)
DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**